

**REMARKS**

This is further to the telephone interview on January 25 2008 between yourself, Dr. Steven Kantner, and the undersigned. During that interview the importance of the silyl groups were discussed in relation to the claimed invention. Particularly the objective of the invention in having an aqueous cosmetic composition that has the conflicting goals of being of relative low viscosity so as to allow for easy application but which when applied can form a durable protective polyurethane coating. This is accomplished in the invention by the silyl functionalization of the polyurethane/urea which allows the polyurethane/urea polymers to form a stable dispersion in the aqueous solution, but on application the water evaporates which drives the hydroxylation of the silyl groups increasing the effective molecular weight of the polyurethane/urea allowing the formation of a durable coating.

It was pointed out in the interview that none of the references applied teach silyl functionalization of a polyurethane/urea at all and particularly not to achieve the above objectives in a cosmetic article or composition.

Attached from Dr Kantner are drawings of the reactions that occur in the invention compositions.

The 35 USC 112 second paragraph objection has been addressed by using the language “a reaction product” in place of “the reaction product”. The 35 USC first paragraph objection should be moot as the language objected to was previously deleted from claim 30 in the response dated July 27, 2007.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

May 6, 2008

Date

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833

By: /William J. Bond/

William J. Bond, Reg. No.: 32,400  
Telephone No.: 651-736-4790